

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 30/09/2025 1:31 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	232 Singlewell Road Gravesend Kent DA11 7RE
Proposal:	Application for variation of condition 2 and 7 attached to planning permission reference number 20241153 for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a 4-bed chalet bungalow; to allow an additonal dropped kerb.
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	

Comments:

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

Firstly, the applicant's repeated changes to the proposals, and the manner in which they have proceeded since the previous planning permission was granted, appear misleading and manipulative. The original plans were only approved after substantial revisions - including the removal of the rear outbuilding and the inclusion of soft landscaping and green space at the back and front - which were essential in gaining approval. These elements have now been reversed through subsequent applications and "lawful development certificate" attempts, effectively reintroducing features that were previously refused.

The construction of the rear outbuilding, which was explicitly removed from the approved plans, demonstrates an attempt to bypass the planning process. It is also being built not in line with granted certificate, too close to the boundary, which is yet another attempt of the applicant to "get what they initially wanted". 4m high building so close to the boundary creates an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. Additionally, the new proposal to replace the approved green frontage with extensive hardstanding for parking, bins, and bicycles removes the soft landscaping that was a critical part of the approved scheme. Taken together, these changes represent a deliberate attempt to "sneak in" the original, refused proposal through piecemeal applications and misleading submissions. This undermines both the integrity of the planning system and the trust of local residents, who are being subjected to continual uncertainty and disruption and council, as so many manipulative applications submissions just wasting taxpayer's money.

The cumulative effect of these changes would result in an oversized development with excessive hard surfaces, no meaningful greenery, and a large outbuilding at the rear - precisely the type of scheme that was previously rejected for good planning reasons. Approving this application would make a mockery of the planning process and reward a pattern of behaviour that seeks to exploit it. For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to refuse this application in its current form.

Kind regards